



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

p. 19) and the Anglo-Saxon enigmas (*E.B.R.*, LI, XXXVIII, XXII, LXXIV, LVI).

A few continental parallels to the queries in our collection, and then I have done. The fearfully made creatures in the Anglo-Saxon poems of musical instruments (*E.B.R.*, XXXII, LXX) are not unlike the prodigies in the Lithuanian and Mecklenburg *Geige* riddles (Schleicher, p. 200; Wossidlo, No. 230\*); but in coincidence of fancy lies doubtless the sole explanation of this resemblance. The Low German "Aderjan" and "Snaderjan" (Eckart, No. 428; also 123, 124) bear a sufficient likeness to the Two Buckets of *E.B.R.*, LIII, to satisfy me that Dietrich has here found the fitting solution;<sup>45</sup> the Onion of *E.B.R.*, LXVI, is "a biter when bitten" as in the German riddle (Wossidlo, No. 190; Petsch, pp. 95-96); and the Communion-cup of *E.B.R.*, LX, is closely akin to the subject of the Tyrolese problem (Renk, *Zs. d. V. f. Vk.*, v, 149, No. 17). And finally, the motives of the highly imaginative query of the Ox (*E.B.R.*, LXXII) appear again far afield in the riddles of Lithuania and Bukowina (Schleicher, 207, 211; Kaendl, *Zs. d. V. f. Vk.*, VIII, 319).

While so short a study as this can, of course, make no claim to exhaustiveness, enough has been said, I hope, to establish the *Exeter Book* problems in their proper place in riddle-literature. I have sought not only to indicate more accurately than has before been done their relation to literary enigmas, but also to trace, what has hitherto passed almost unnoticed, their indebtedness to popular motives.<sup>46</sup>

FREDERICK TUPPER, JR.

*University of Vermont.*

<sup>45</sup> Trautmann's solutions, "Broom" and later "Flail" seem far-fetched and beside the mark, while Walz's answer, "Yoke of Oxen led into the barn or house by a female slave" smacks of that fatal obviousness so dear to victims of the riddler's art.

<sup>46</sup> Since the appearance of my first article in the January number of the *Notes*, I have read, in the Harvard Library, Pitre's important Introduction to his *Indovinelli, Dubbi, Scioglilingua del Popolo Siciliano* (*Bibl. delle Trad. Pop. Sic.*, xx), Torino-Palermo, 1897. His entertaining and scholarly treatment of several points that I have independently considered—e. g., "the literary sources and popular origins of riddles"—has simply strengthened my views upon these topics. In at least one matter of detail, however, I must admit fault. The German *Ilo*

## NOTES ON THE HISTORY OF FREE OPEN *o* IN ANGLO-NORMAN.

The present article is a chapter detached from an *essai de grammaire* of Anglo-Norman which I shall soon publish; the consideration of this dialect will represent, in its turn, but the first part of a projected *Manual of Old French Dialects*, which, as the first part will show, is now approaching completion. My hope is that material thus brought together for the first time in convenient reference form may constitute a background for the re-investigation of many points of detail of Old French grammar that are still obscure. With texts, dates and facts of each dialect as an entity before us, we can follow the definite history of a given phenomenon in a given dialect and decide what bearing it may have on general Old French. In a manual of the kind intended, it is impossible to treat at length of all these separate points; but, in order to illustrate the use to which I trust my compilation may be put, I have inserted a partial development of some ideas that suggest themselves in an examination of the history of open *o* in Anglo-Norman. I now offer the same here in advance, thinking that a new presentation of the light that Anglo-Norman developments throw on the general subject of open *o* may be of interest to the student of Old French who, perhaps, will not look for a consideration of the general subject in a special treatise on dialects.

The "definite history" of many of the phenomena arising in a study of open *o* is yet to be written. One cannot read what has been proposed and, after an examination of the evidence for himself, be satisfied that the last word has been said. I offer some fragmentary suggestions on various points, hoping thereby to invite attention to and discussion of them. A final solution demands a new, detailed study of open *o* in each old dialect; such a study will surely bear fruit.—In accordance with my general plan, I treat first the (supposably) phonetic developments of the given sound, afterwards the orthographic symbols used by the scribes

riddle must not be regarded as "distinctively Teutonic" (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xviii, p. 7): Pitre has proved (pp. LXXX-LXXXVII) that, in the form of a *Rätselmärchen*, it obtains in many countries of Southern Europe.

to indicate such developments. To the first class, then, belong *o*, *ue*, *eu*, *u* and *e*; to the second, *oe*, *oi*, *eo*, *e*, *ö*. For the sake of completeness, and on account of their interdependence, I shall mention each one of these even when I have nothing new to add.

1. *o*. The keeping of *o* in its undiphthongized (by the side of the diphthongized) form is one of our Anglo-Norman peculiarities. We find the *o*, of course, in our older texts, though not with consistent frequency: *pople*, *pot*, *quor*, *ovre*, *volt*, etc. Philippe de Thaün probably did not know the diphthongization of the *o*; <sup>1</sup> in the *Lois Guillaume*, *o* is used to the entire exclusion of *ue* or *oe*; <sup>2</sup> in the Oxford (or rather Montebourg) and Cambridge Psalters *o* is found, though not in the majority of cases; <sup>3</sup> in the *Quatre Livres des Rois*, again, *o* prevails in the proportion of four to one <sup>4</sup> (that is, as compared with *ue*, *oe*, etc.). Leaving this older group of texts, we note the firm hold of the *o* in Anglo-Norman in that it recurs in the monuments of a much later date, certainly up to the middle of the thirteenth century, as, for example, in Angier, <sup>5</sup> Chardri, <sup>6</sup> Guillaume de Berneville, <sup>7</sup> *Amadas* <sup>8</sup> and *Boeve*. <sup>9</sup>—In connection with this *o* is to be recorded the *oi* found in Anglo-Norman as a representative of open *o* before a palatal by the side of the regular *ui*, (*hoi*, *poisse*, etc.); this *oi* is doubtless a reminiscence of the original *o* before the palatal previous to diphthongization (> *uoi*, *uei*, *ui*) though it is by no

means so frequent as the *o* (for *ue*) to which we have just referred. <sup>10</sup>

2. *ue*. This is not the place to enter upon, or even to refer to, the extensive bibliography on the interesting general questions raised with regard to the history of the diphthong *ue*: whether the *u* of *ue* was pronounced as *ou* or *ü*; if the diphthong was rising or falling; when the pronunciation *ö* (Mod. Fr. *eu*) came in, and the like. The last point (*eu*) is particularly difficult to decide for Anglo-Norman, both on account of the marked confusion of orthographies, and because the *eu* to which we are accustomed in French texts of the continent is extremely rare in our dialect (cf. below, § 3). We have reason to suppose that, for a time at least, *ue* may have had a double value in Anglo-Norman; that is, *u-e*, and *ö*. <sup>11</sup> The earliest text for which the pronunciation *ö* is claimed for *ue* is, I think, Chardri. <sup>12</sup> (The sound *ö*, however, may have existed earlier (cf. below, § 6, d).

As to whether *ue* (and *ie*) were rising or falling diphthongs, it is difficult to discover essential facts on which to base conclusions. We find as variants of *ie* (<open *æ*) *i* and *e*, and of *ue*, *u* and *e*; of these variants we may say, I think, that Anglo-Norman favored *e* for *ie* and *u* for *ue*; this fact seems to point to an original *iê* and *ûe*. The *Oxford Psalter*, where we have marks of accentuation, renders *ie* by *iê*, *ue* by both *ûe* and *uê*. The stress must have varied at different periods of the language, or with different scribes or in some other (unknown) way; such was obviously the case in our dialect where we meet *ie*, *i*, *e*; *ue*, *u*, *e*. Theorists on the original nature of these diphthongs will, I fear, be driven to seek their data outside of Anglo-Norman lines. <sup>13</sup>

An important point to be observed with regard to *ue* in our dialect is that it may rhyme with close *e*, and thus give rise to a set of rhymes whose exact parallel does not exist on the continent; such a rhyme is that of *quer* with infinitives of the first conjugation, as *honurer* or *counter*. These

<sup>1</sup> Mall, *Li Cumpoz Philippe de Thaün*, Strassburg, 1873, p. 48; Walberg, *Le Bestiaire de P. de T.*, Paris, 1900, p. lxxxv.

<sup>2</sup> Matzke, *Lois de Guillaume le Conquérant*, Paris, 1899, p. xlvii.

<sup>3</sup> Harseim, *Vokalismus und Consonantism. Oxf. Psalt., Roman. Stud.*, iv, 292; Schumann, *V. und C. Camb. Psalt.*, Heilbronn, 1883, p. 33.

<sup>4</sup> Plähn, *Les Q. L. R.*, Göttingen, 1888, p. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Meyer, *Romania*, xii, 196; Cloran, *The Dialogues of Gregory the Great*, Strassburg, 1901, p. 48.

<sup>6</sup> Koch, Chardry's *Josephas, Set Dormans und Petit Plet* (Altfr. Bibl. i), Heilbronn, 1879, p. xxviii; cf. *Zf. Rom. Phil.*, iii, 593.

<sup>7</sup> Paris et Bos, *La Vie de Saint Gilles, par G. de B.* (Soc. Anc. Text. Fr.) Paris, 1881, p. xxxi.

<sup>8</sup> Andresen, *Zf. Rom. Phil.*, xii, 85.

<sup>9</sup> Stimming, *Der Anglonormannische Boeve de Haumtone*, (Bibl. Norman. vii) Halle, 1899, p. 207.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Suchier, *Altfr. Grammatik*, p. 59.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Koschwitz, *Ueberlieferung und Sprache der Chans. du Voyage de Charlemagne*. Heilbronn, 1876, pp. 29 and 73.

<sup>12</sup> Koch, *o. e.*, p. xxviii.

<sup>13</sup> For some general remarks here, cf. Suchier, *Zf. Rom. Phil.* i, 291, *Grammatik*, pp. 40 and 48; Nyrop, *Litbl. Germ. Rom. Phil.* i. 223.

rhymes have been cited for *Auban*, *Donnei des Amants*, *Bozon*, and other texts.<sup>14</sup>

3. *eu*. Few examples of *eu* for close *o* exist in Anglo-Norman, and fewer of *eu* for open *o*. Stimming<sup>15</sup> gives *seut*, *veut* (in which, however, the *u* may be equivalent to an *l* which has vocalized), *queur*, *peuple*, *veulle*, *peut*, *demeure* [*demeure* should not be included here since the open *o* of the Latin early became close in this word<sup>16</sup>]. Apparently we shall have to study each example and each text separately in order to determine approximately the phonetic significance of the *eu*. In the *Vie de Saint Thomas*, for example, Meyer assigns different values to the *eu* according as it represents French *ue* (*veut*) or open *o* (*eurent* for *orent*).<sup>17</sup> What shall we say when we encounter a rhyme like one in the *Apocalypse*, *touz : leus* (LŒUM)?

4. *u*. This letter used for open *o* has always been recognized as a marked Anglo-Norman characteristic; it is found in *Philippe de Thaün*, *Oxford Psalter*, *Quatre Livres des Rois* and *Brandan*, among our earlier texts: *buf*, *put*, *vult*, *wrent*, etc.<sup>18</sup> Our dialect is, apparently, the only one in which we find an open *o* represented by *u*. If, however, we look upon this *u* as a reduction of the diphthong *ue* and not as a direct variant of undeveloped open *o*, it will not seem so abnormal. In the earlier stages of studies in our dialect the *u* was treated as such a variant of the *o*,<sup>19</sup> and this view of the *u* appears natural enough, since the keeping of the *o* itself (cf. above, § 1) was a distinct peculiarity, and considering *u* as a variant of so common an element was, to all intents, not

stretching a point. To my mind, however, this opinion was entirely erroneous. First of all, the use of *u* for open *o* would necessarily imply a certain assimilation of open *o* and close *o* (for the latter, *u* is the constant Norman and Anglo-Norman equivalent); we may note, too, that *o* for original close *o* is kept, with some degree of frequency in our earlier texts, being preferred to *u* in *Philippe*<sup>20</sup> and *Brandan*,<sup>21</sup> and used often in *Angier*,<sup>22</sup> *Chardri*<sup>23</sup> and *Adam*;<sup>24</sup> we would expect to find the explanation of such supposed assimilation in the fact that the *o* for open *o* was used so often and so early as to lose, in part, its separate identity, and become of the same value as close *o* (that is, *u*). The facts, however, do not warrant our assuming the assimilation. Open *o* was evidently a very independent element in Anglo-Norman; while open and close *e* rhyme together in checked position from the time of our earliest texts, such is not the case for open and close *o* (except, of course, before nasals, both free and checked which do not enter into the discussion of the present point). To suppose assimilation at all, we would have to place it at an early date, since *u* for open (or close) *o* is early; if it had been early the probabilities are that it would have been thorough and extensive, because simplifications, of whatever kind, were favored in Anglo-Norman; but our scribes obviously did not confuse the two sounds. They had little difficulty in denoting the value or values of close *o*; from the earliest texts we find *o*, then *u*; *ou* was not popular in the dialect in its early period; examples of *ou* may be counted by ones and twos up to Angier; *eu* was an exotic, late and isolated. When we note the expedients for indicating the developments of open *o*, on the other hand, we find that the orthographic variants for them (cf. below, § 6) as compared with those for close *o* are in the proportion of three to one; our scribes had difficulties with the open *o* from the very outset; if the developments of this latter had, in any sense, approached those of close *o*, whose value was so definite, the average Anglo-Norman scribe would have been glad to combine the two; it was a coincidence that *u* should appear

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Stürzinger, *Orthographia Gallica* (Altfr. Bibl. VIII) Heilbronn, 1884, p. 46; Paris, *Romania* XXV, 532; Smith et Meyer, *Les Contes Moralises de Nicole Bozon* (Soc. Anc. Text. Fr.) Paris, 1889, p. lix, 3.

<sup>15</sup> Boeve, p. 208.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *Zt. Rom. Phil.* II, 509, and Paris, *Vie de St. Gilles*, p. xxxi, footnote 1. Stimming mentioned *demeur* as showing close *o* on p. 190 (Boeve). On p. 208 he is quoting from Stürzinger, who gives open *o*.

<sup>17</sup> Meyer, *Fragments d'une Vie de Saint Thomas de Cantorbéry* (Soc. Anc. Text. Fr.) Paris, 1885, p. xxix.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Gröber, *Zt. Rom. Phil.*, II, 509; Meyer-Lübke, *Gram. Lang. Rom.*, I, 202, § 217; Suchier, *Français et Provençal*, p. 23, *Grammatik*, p. 41; Stimming, *Boeve*, p. 208.

<sup>19</sup> Cf., for example, Mall, *Cumpos*, p. 50; Fichte, *Die Flexion im Cambridger Psalter*, Halle, 1879, p. 63; *Zt. Rom. Phil.* II, 481.

<sup>20</sup> Mall, *Cumpos*, p. 41.

<sup>21</sup> Hammer, *Zt. Rom. Phil.* IX, 87.

<sup>22</sup> Meyer, *Romania*, XII, 197.

<sup>23</sup> Stimming, *Boeve*, p. 190.

for open *o* (that is, for *ue* < open *o*) and for close *o* too. We must remember *e* for *ue* too (cf. below, § 5); to claim that *u* is not from *ue* destroys the possibility of a reasonable explanation for *e*. This latter shows that at one time, or with some scribes, the emphasis was on the *e* (of *ue*); the *u*, that with others the accent bore on the *u*; the two, *u* and *e* are surely to be explained side by side. With *ue* so early and constant a product in general French and in Anglo-Norman too, we must be suspicious of explanations of any phase of the history of open *o* that do not take into account, when possible, this *ue*. When we confront *vult* with *vuelt* it is certainly more reasonable to look at *vult* as a derivation from *vuelt* (the original general French form) than to think that, although we can detect no apparent reason for it, the open *o* went two different ways in the two words, becoming *u* in *vult*, diphthongizing in *vuelt*. We may derive some additional light on our point from a comparison of *ue* and *ie* (< open *ē*). The phenomena associated with these two must have been alike in many particulars. For *ie* we have in Anglo-Norman *i* and *e* (*cil*, *cel* = *ciel*) just as for *ue* we find *u* and *e*. I know of no suggestion that *i* for *ie* is a direct variant of open *ē*, without passing through the stage *ie*; yet *i* is used for close *e*, too, even rhyming with it,<sup>24</sup> and close and open *e* are early assimilated in checked position. The analogy of *i* from *ie*, then, seems to point to *u* from *ue*.

5. *e*. The use of *e* for *ue* is likewise considered as characteristic of our dialect. We note little discussion as to any time difference between the *e* and the *u* for *ue*. Meyer-Lübke treats of *e* first, saying that it occurs early, then he continues: 'One is surprised to find *u* also for *ue*,' as if *e* were the more characteristic or usual.<sup>25</sup> Stimming<sup>26</sup> says that *ue* becomes *e* especially after 1200. If what I have said above (§ 4) as to the derivation of *u* from *ue* be correct, it follows that I must consider the original accentuation of the combination to have been *úe*, and, therefore, any time difference must be in favor of *u* as older than *e*. This "difference" in Anglo-Norman, however, is merely relative, and we need not suppose that *u* was used regularly for a period of years and that

afterwards *e* came in; the difference was doubtless slight, and the employ of the one or the other depended upon the circumstances which influenced each individual scribe. The texts cited by Stürzinger and Stimming for *e* are comparatively late: Adgar, Angier, *Auban*, etc. (*em*, *fleves*, *selt*, *velt*, etc.)

## 6. Orthographic Variants.

a. *oe*. This is found with great frequency in Norman and Anglo-Norman texts, especially at the beginning of words, and is, supposably, a device of the scribes to distinguish *ue* (= *ue* < open *o*) from *ue* (= *ve*) by writing the former as *oe*.<sup>27</sup> (See, however, the last few lines of my remarks under *c*, below).

b. *oi*. We have here an orthographical sign of quite frequent occurrence. Stimming<sup>28</sup> cites examples from *Brandan*, *Tristan*, *Chardri*, *Boeve*, and a few others; as, *estoit*, (*estuet*), *voit*, (*vuelt*), *poit*, (*puet*), etc. Stimming suggests that we meet here an instance of "umgekehrte schreibung;" he starts from the reduced forms, *estet*, *pet*, *vet*, etc.; these the scribe ignorantly thinks to restore (?) to *estoit*, *poit*, *voit* because he confuses *estet*, *pet*, *vet* with derivatives of original close *e* (< Latin *ē* or *ĭ*) for which *oi* was the proper French equivalent, and by no means absent from Anglo-Norman.—The explanation does not appeal to me, though I do not insist on my own way of looking at the variant in question. Analogies for confusions and pseudo-restorations are not far to seek in the dialect, it is true; we witness such entanglements among the various *e*'s; there is the *e* < *ā*, the *e* reduced from *ie* (< open *ē*) and the *e* reduced from *ei* (< close *ē*); confronted with these (and still other) *e*'s, the scribes became apparently bewildered, and, in their desire to reconstitute correct forms they replaced *e* < *ā* by *ie* (*piert* = *PARET*), *e* < *ei* by *ie* (*fiez* = *feiz*, *fois*), and, on the other hand they wrote *ei* for *e* < *ā* (*espeie* = *espee*) and for *e* < *ie* (*teurz* = *tierz*), etc.; in other words, general confusion. I hint at this well-known condition of affairs in order to bring out the point that our scribes were entirely consistent in their mistakes; every confusion worked two, or more, ways. Con-

<sup>24</sup> Stimming, *Boeve*, pp. lv, lvi and 188.

<sup>25</sup> *Gram. Lang. Rom.*, I, 202, § 217.

<sup>26</sup> *Boeve*, p. 208.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Gram. Lang. Rom.* I, 196, 198, § 211.

<sup>28</sup> *Boeve*, p. 208. Stimming omits *bois* (*BÖVES*) from *Cumpoz* (*L*) cited by Suchier, *Gram.*, p. 41.

sequently it seems to me that if the scribes had really confused the *e* (of *ue*) with the *e* (of *ei*), we would rightly expect to find them using some other variant of the *e* (of *ei*), and notably *ei* itself rather than *oi*, which is not a regular Anglo-Norman product, as is *ei*. No *ei* (*ai*) is recorded, so far as I am aware, as a variant of the *e* for *ue*, although *ei* occurs for every other *e* in Anglo-Norman, even for checked *e* (open and close).

To my mind, then, the confusion referred to by Stimming is not the one which influenced our scribes; for that matter, I question using *e* as a background for explanations in general, since it was comparatively late and rare. What more evident starting-points do we need than *estot*, *vot*, *pot*, present in the language from the very beginning (cf. above, §1)? These the scribe changed to *estoit*, *voit*, *poit*, just as he often (ignorantly) corrected (?) every simple vowel (except *i* of course) in his language by adding *i* to it, on account of the frequency with which his eye encountered *ai*, *ei*, *oi*, *ui* which had developed regularly before palatals. The analogy for his *oi* is even closer than in this general tradition, for *oi* < open *o* before a palatal exists in our older texts as a remnant of the old *oi* before development (> *uoi*, *uei*, *ui*), just as simple *o* represents the stage before the diphthongization of open *o*.

c. *eo*. The use of *eo* for checked *e* in Anglo-Norman is often referred to, though the examples are not frequent: *Camb. Psalter* and *Brandan iceols*, *Camb. Psalt. feorm* (FIRMUM).<sup>29</sup> We find *eo* likewise for *ue* (or rather for a development of open *o*) before both oral and nasal consonants, and, as so employed, it constitutes another peculiarity of Anglo-Norman manuscripts; *Oxf. and Camb. Psalt. veolt*, *eovre*; *Roland*, *deol*; *Camb. Psalt. and Quatre Livres des Rois*, *heom*, *seon*,<sup>30</sup> etc. It may, at first sight, appear illogical not to consider *eo* (for *e*) and *eo* (for open *o*) together; we can easily conceive of the pronunciation *e-o* in *feorm* where the *o* may have served as a glide; we might think of the *o* of *deol* or *heom* as such a glide too from *e* to *l* or *m*. I have already indicated, however, that examples from our texts do not demonstrate

that *e* for *ue* was early or frequent enough to allow us to take it as a basis for explaining early variants of developments of open *o* (like the present *eo*, and like *oi* considered above); as we have already noted the coincidence of *u* for open *o* and *u* for close *o* without any necessary connection between the two, there is nothing abnormal implied in supposing two *eo*'s to have existed independently; in fact it is quite sure that *eo* indicated at least three different values in Anglo-Norman, *e-o*, a sound approaching *eu*, and close *e*; consequently, if we can find evidence, within the limits of open *o* developments, as to the value of the symbol in connection with open *o*, that evidence should have its weight. Now when we have so many variants for one original element, as here for open *o*, it seems to me that we should observe these variants like we do manuscripts, for example, with the hope of discovering some possible relationship among them. In order to discover the value of *eo* (for *ue*), about the only safe method is to compare other signs used for *ue* in texts in which *eo* occurs too, especially signs of known value. Those of (supposably) known value are *e* and *ø*, the latter usually being understood to indicate a sound like Modern French *eu*; this value (*eu*) for *eo* was, in fact, suggested very early.<sup>31</sup> Again there is no doubt but that *eo* was used as the equivalent of a known close *e* (*cheot*, CADIT) though not in earliest Anglo-Norman;<sup>32</sup> so we might say that at one time, comparatively early, *eo* was used for *eu*; at another, later, for *e*. There is no doubt about the latter use of *eo* (for *e*), but I question the conclusiveness of the opinions that assign a value *e-o*, or *eu*, or *e* to *eo* for the earlier stages of Anglo-Norman.

Returning, then, to my idea of comparison of variants, I would suggest the following: The regular phonetic representatives of open *o* in Anglo-Norman were *o*, *ue*, *u* and *e*. The appearances of *o*, *ö*, *ø* and *eo* in the manuscripts coincide; the last three are attempts of the scribes to indicate a sound of the *o* that was not the simple open *o*, nor yet the distinct diphthong *ue*, but an approach to the diphthong which the scribe did not know exactly how to designate. By the side of open *o*

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Suchier, *Grammatik*, p. 82.

<sup>30</sup> For texts and examples, cf. Stürzinger, *Orthographia Gallica*, pp. 44-46; Suchier, *Zt. Rom. Phil.*, I, 569, *Grammatik*, p. 41; Stimming, *Boeve*, pp. 207, 208.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Koschwitz, *Ueberlieferung*, p. 29.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Suchier, *Grammatik*, p. 42.

and *ue* there existed an intermediate phonetic element just as between open *e* and *ie* there was a product which our scribes indicate by the indefinite *ee*. This element, doubtless a remnant of an indefinite intermediate stage for open *o*, was the one our scribes were trying to fix, and the various signs used, *ö*, *ø* and *eo* reflect their uncertainty. In my opinion *oe* may well have originated in the same way, and later have found a settled place in orthography because it happened to lend itself to the expression of a necessary distinction between *ue* and *ve*.

d. *ø*. This sign occurs in the *Cambridge Psalter*, *ilæc pøple*, etc. Suchier speaks of it as indicating the sound *eu*.<sup>33</sup> Cf. my remarks above (c).

e. *ö*. Examples for this have been cited only for the *Oxford Psalter*, *pöple*, *repröce*, *öil*, *ölie*. Cf. my remarks above (c).

May I now dignify these remarks by attempting a species of summary of the results suggested?

Nowhere is the influence of individual caprice on Anglo-Norman scribes and the contradictory nature of phenomena in that dialect better illustrated than in the history of open *o*. In the face of the fact that the first authentic cases of the diphthong *ue* in any French monument are to be sought in the *Domesday Book* in the famous *Buenuasleth*, *Septmuele* and *Rainbuedurt*,<sup>34</sup> we note, at the very outset of our study a marked fondness for the retention of simple *o* in our early texts. May it be that by the side of *ue* our scribes heard a lengthening of the *o* which they were not sure how to indicate, and that *o* where kept is so kept because they did not know how to transcribe this lengthening? May not the *o*, even when retained in the orthography have had always the diphthongal sound hinted at in the use of *ö*, *ø*, *eo* and *oe*? The early (and rare) appearance of *ö* and *ø* seems to me to point to their use for a sound unlike any other sound the scribes were accustomed to; when *ue*, *u* and *e* were definitely established, these two signs no longer present themselves. The *oe* and *eo* used in conjunction with these two, indicated the same uncertain element; but *oe* and *eo* found places in the orthography for reasons quite apart from their relation with the early

history of open *o*. Surely it must occasion less surprise that our dialect should offer a remnant of a stage in the development of open *o* than that it should show the original *o* itself so consistently and so long. Literary, or continental, influence finally decided the supremacy of *ue*, and the other signs used found no permanent place in the orthography, with the exception of *oe* (for reasons already suggested).

It seems entirely probable that *u* where found does not represent a direct passage of open *o* to *u*, but is in all cases a reduction of the diphthong *ue*.

The orthography *oi* represents a confusion of simple *o* with *oi* out of *o* before a palatal, and is to be likened to a similar confusion of *a* with *ai*, or *u* with *ui*.

The *eo*, in the early language, does not necessarily designate a sound *e-o*, or *eu*, or *e*, but is to be classed with other variants of *o* (*ö* and *ø*) as indicating an indefinite combination which existed by the side of *o* and *ue*. (No one knows better than myself that this point will be the subject of attack, but I believe it has a germ of truth in it). If *eo* were the only variant of open *o*, there would be nothing to do except to compare it with other *eo*'s in the dialect; but we find *ö* and *ø* which occur for open *o* alone; *eo* as used for *o*, then, is to be compared with them; *eu* for close and open *o* is late in Anglo-Norman, and represents the importation of scribes who happened to be well acquainted with continental French and introduced *eu* as they did *oi* (for *ei* < close *e*). Our *ö*, *ø* and *eo* probably indicated, not *eu*, but the diphthong between open *o* and *ue* already referred to.

As to *oe*, may it not have been one of these early devices for indicating the same indefinite sound, and may not its use have been to mark a distinction between *ue* and *ve* secondary?

LOUIS EMIL MENDER.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

---

MR. SIDNEY LEE AND SPENSER'S  
*Amoretti*.

Doubtless the radicalism of Mr. Sidney Lee's conception of the *Sonnets* of Shakespeare may be regarded as a protest against the imaginative per-

<sup>33</sup> *Gram.*, p. 41; cf. Vising, *Jhrsbrecht. Rom. Phil.* II, 1, 250.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. *Zi. Rom. Phil.*, VIII, 359.